

Technical problems and existing gaps in the available information, such as a first continuance date and then a custody intake date without any data on the court trial date, were noted as problematic. Each of these deficiencies were noted by 13 percent of the responding sample. Overall, 24 (51.1%) of the 47 survey participants responded by offering at least one negative or least beneficial feature of the system.

As part of the survey participants were asked to rank SAVAN on a variety of process measures including the victim notification process, registration, SAVAN installation and maintenance, and fiscal management. Respondents were asked to rank 11 process factors on a 10 point Likert scale ranging from one (poor) to 10 (outstanding).

Overall, the respondents rated the process aspects of SAVAN quite highly with eight of the 11 factors receiving an average score of seven or greater. Two aspects received an average ranking between six and seven with only one item receiving an average score below the scale midpoint of five.

The highest rated, or most impressive, process components were: the responders' agencies relationship with Appriss/VINE, i.e. the provision of technical assistance ($X=7.56$), the responsiveness of the SAVAN system operators ($X=7.35$), the accessibility of services ($X=7.29$), and SAVAN maintenance and troubleshooting ($X=7.28$). The fiscal management of the SAVAN system ($X=7.18$), the actual notification process itself ($X=7.07$) and the development and installation processes ($X=7.04$) were also perceived to be highly effective.

The survey participants agreed that the SAVAN system has substantially improved the ability to track offenders for both members of the criminal justice system and for crime victims and their families. Eighteen respondents (42.9%) suggested that the system has had a great impact in this area with another 13 (31%) noting that it has exerted an average level of impact. Nineteen percent felt that it has demonstrated a minimal impact with the remaining 7.1 percent noting that SAVAN has had no impact on improving the effectiveness of tracking offenders and determining their location.

Seven factors were identified based upon the goals and objectives of the SAVAN initiative with the respondents being asked to rank each on a ten-point scale ranging from one (no impact) to 10 (great impact). All of the seven factors received average rankings above the scale midpoint of five, suggesting that the system has exerted a positive and strong impact and is achieving its stated goals and objectives. The two primary goals of enabling victim notification to occur, and to make this process less burdensome on local criminal justice agencies, ($X=6.80$) and the goal of increasing victim awareness, regarding the location of offenders, ($X=6.85$) received the highest average scores. The goal of informing victims of their respective court cases received an average impact score of 5.92 with the actual impact of SAVAN on the local criminal justice system receiving a slightly higher score of 5.97. Thus the findings validate the assumption that the SAVAN network is accomplishing one of its intended purposes and demonstrating an above average impact on reducing, or minimizing, the workload of the local criminal justice agencies as related to victim notification.